



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2013

Ms. Halfreda Anderson-Nelson  
Senior Assistant General Counsel  
Dallas Area Rapid Transit  
P.O. Box 660163  
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2013-21920

Dear Ms. Anderson-Nelson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 508689 (DART ORR No. 10252).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for the statements of qualifications and bids submitted in response to a specified request for proposal.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position as to the public availability of the submitted information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. You state you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released.<sup>2</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of

---

<sup>1</sup>We note DART received clarification of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>The third parties notified pursuant to section 552.305 are: Blue Line Builders; Bowman Engineering & Consulting, Inc.; SOC Constructors Joint Venture; South Oak Cliff Transit Partners ("SOCTP"); and The C3A Team.

exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We received comments from SOCTP. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from SOCTP on why the company's submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, DART may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in it.

SOCTP claims its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the

Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>3</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. See ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; see also ORD 661 at 5.

Upon review, we conclude SOCTP has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find SOCTP has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organizations, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110), 175 at 4 (1997) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Therefore, none of SOCTP's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a). SOCTP further argues some of the submitted information consists of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under

---

<sup>3</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We note although SOCTP seeks to withhold its pricing information, it was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue, and the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Thus, we find SOCTP has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3. Accordingly, none of SOCTP's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b). As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, DART must release the submitted information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/tch

Ref: ID# 508689

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William T. Eliopoulos  
Counsel for South Oak Cliff  
Transit Partners  
Rutan & Tucker, L.L.P.  
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 200  
Palo Alto, California 94306  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael J. McWay  
SOC Constructors Joint Venture  
Suite 400  
12001 North Central Expressway  
Dallas, Texas 75243  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Shankan Narayanan  
The C3A Team  
6330 Commerce Drive, Suite 150  
Irving, Texas 75063  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Leslie Duke, P.E.  
Vice President, General Manager DFW  
Bowman Engineering & Consulting, Inc.  
Suite 312  
13140 Coit Road  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gilbert Neves  
President and CEO  
Odebrecht - Blue Line Builders  
201 Alhambra Circle, Suite 1400  
Coral Gables, Florida 33134  
(w/o enclosures)